UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

)
) No. 19-1489C
) Judge Kaplan
)

OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS

Defendant has filed a Motion to Dismiss claiming this case does not allege facts supporting a breach of contract or negligence claim. Defendant is incorrect. Plaintiff has amply alleged facts demonstrating that Defendant did, in fact, breach a contract with Plaintiff, and act negligently in connection with this matter. In further support of his claims, Plaintiff attaches various USPS documents (See Exhibits 1-5), already in USPS custody but oddly not mentioned in Defendant's motion to dismiss even though Defendant sought an extension from this Court to file its response based on its claimed need to retrieve these documents.

FACTS

As set forth in Plaintiff's complaint, on or about June 11, 2018, Plaintiff went to Defendant's Belmont, Massachusetts branch and sent a brand new Gucci backpack to Los Angeles, California through the U.S. Mail after selling it on eBay for \$800.00. (Exhibit 1) Plaintiff paid \$1,250.00 for the backpack in August 2017. (Exhibit 5).

After the backpack was shipped, but before it was delivered, Plaintiff purchased an intercept from Defendant on June 23, 2018. (Exhibit 2) An intercept is a contractual guarantee

that a package will not be delivered to the addressee, and will be returned to the sender.

Defendant confirmed Plaintiff's purchase of the intercept, and informed Plaintiff that the intercept had taken effect. (See Plaintiff's Complaint) This was a false statement. On June 25, 2018 at 08:58 the backpack is described in USPS tracking documents as "INTERCEPTED" at the USPS facility in Los Angeles, California. (Exhibit 2) The next entry in the tracking document states that at exactly the same time, June 25, 2018 at 08:58, the backpack was "DELIVERED, INDIVIDUAL PICKED UP AT POSTAL FACILITY." (Exhibit 2)

When Plaintiff learned that USPS had *delivered* the backpack immediately *after* intercepting it, he contacted USPS officials in Massachusetts and California. (See Complaint) Plaintiff was advised to speak with a postal inspector in California. Plaintiff gave the inspector the address to which the backpack was originally sent. The inspector stated that he would initiate an investigation, attempt to locate the package, retrieve it, and send back to Plaintiff. The inspector advised Plaintiff to contact USPS customer service in Boston. (See Complaint)

Plaintiff contacted USPS customer service in Boston. An official there took a description of the missing item and promised to contact the California postal inspector to ensure that an investigation took place, and to determine whether the backpack had been located and retrieved. Neither the California postal inspector nor the Boston customer service official ever followed up with the Plaintiff. USPS officials in both states told Plaintiff that they would assign postal inspectors to investigate and attempt to recover the backpack, but Defendant took no such steps. Plaintiff repeatedly asked USPS officials about the investigation, and was promised that an investigation would take place, but no USPS official ever investigated the matter or otherwise took steps to recover the backpack, locate and retrieve the backpack, or determine what happened to the backpack. (See Complaint)

The backpack was wrongfully delivered, lost, or stolen at the USPS postal facility in Los Angeles California, at exactly the same time that it was intercepted, on or about June 25, 2018.

In late October, 2018, an official at the Belmont, MA post office looked at computerized USPS tracking information and stated that it appeared the package had been located by USPS officials in Los Angeles, California, and was en route back to Belmont. (See Complaint) This same USPS official stated that it was not necessary to file a claim because the package had been recovered. That information was incorrect because soon thereafter, the manager at the Belmont, MA post office, Erick Scholl, advised Plaintiff that the backpack had not been located, and that he would send a fax himself to a customer service fax number to determine the location of the backpack. Mr. Scholl stated that he personally called the California postal inspector many times, but received no response. (Exhibits 3-4)

A week or so later, Mr. Scholl told Plaintiff that he did not have any luck determining where the backpack was, and that Plaintiff should call 1-800-332-0317 and ask for a complaint "form 1000" because the package could not be retrieved. A few weeks later, Plaintiff received "form 1000" in the mail. He completed the form and submitted a complaint via certified mail to the USPS Domestic Claims Department in Missouri. Plaintiff's claim and appeal were denied by Defendant. (See Complaint)

BREACH OF CONTRACT/NEGLIGENCE

Contrary to Defendant's argument, Plaintiffs' claims are not simply that a contract was created by the purchase of an intercept. Plaintiff's backpack was successfully intercepted, and then immediately delivered to an unknown individual at the USPS facility in Los Angeles California. Defendant created a contract with Plaintiff by accepting Plaintiff's money for the

intercept and stating, verbally and in the tracking order, that the intercept was successful, and when that information proved to be false, promising to initiate an investigation which never took place, and when *that* information proved to be false, telling Plaintiff the backpack had been recovered and that there was no need to file a complaint, and when *that* information proved to be false, telling Plaintiff the backpack had probably been stolen by a USPS employee, and that he should file a claim with the USPS, which was hopeless, and ultimately denied.

Defendant made false statements and no attempt whatsoever to determine whether a USPS employee stole the backpack, or whether it had been delivered improperly by a USPS postal employee at the USPS facility in Los Angeles California. USPS records indicate the intercept was successfully effectuated at the USPS postal facility in Los Angeles, California at the same time when the intercept failed, yet Defendant failed even to visit the putative addressee's home to determine whether that person picked up the backpack, so it could at least be determined whether a customer or an employee at the Los Angeles Post Office had taken the backpack.

Plaintiff relied on Defendant's various statements to his detriment. USPS officials negligently performed the intercept, and negligently and recklessly stated that the intercept was successful when it was not, then later stated that that they found the backpack, and when both claims proved untrue, they promised to conduct an investigation. Had these false representations not been made, Plaintiff could have reached out to law enforcement sources, or sought assistance from others, in an attempt to recover his backpack.

For all the above reasons, Defendant's motion should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Cameron Ellis, pro se

Dated: December 30, 2019

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that on this 30th day of December, 2019, I caused to be placed in the United States mail (first-class postage prepaid), a copy of the

foregoing Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss_addressed as follows:

Mollie Finnan

Cameron Ellis

Claudia Burke

U.S. Department of Justice

Civil Division

Commercial Litigation Branch

P.O. Box 480, Ben Franklin Station

Washington, DC 20044

Product Pasching & Reporting

Document 9 Filed 01/14/20 Page 7 of 12

Hanre

Search

waanst Enlay

Anteol Camarianianis.

PYEARING

William Comparate Carrier and

16,21 M DE, JUIE

CON UNITED STATES SELLI POVIM SERVICE

USPS Tracking Intranet Tracking Number Result

Result for Domestic Tracking Number 9534 6121 6263 8162 2413 76

Destination and Origin Destination ZIP Code City 900441242 LOS ANGELES CA Origin ZIP Code | City State

024789998 BELMONT MA

User Wordy 1 Stone

Tracking Number Classification

Class/Service

Class/Service:

USPS Retail Ground USPS Tracking

Class of Mail Code/Description:

BP / USPS Retail Ground®

Destination Address Information

Address:

11530 S NORMANDIE AVE APT 10

City: LOS ANGELES State: CA

5-Digit ZIP Code: 4-Digit ZIP Code add on:

90044 1242 10

Delivery Point Code: Record Type Code: Delivery Type:

Building/Apartment Residential, Central

Origin / Return / Pickup Address Information

Address:

City:

5-Digit ZIP Code:

02478 4-Digit ZIP Code add on: 9998

Shipping Services File

Shipping Services File Number: Date/Time Tendering Mail:

9475 0016 9932 0852 1704 46

Shipping Services File Type:

07/07/2018 08:55

2 - Tracking File

Shipment Accepted:

Service Delivery Information

Service Performance Date: **Network Predicted Delivery Date:**

Expected Delivery by: Monday, 06/18/2018 by 8:00pm

Expected Delivery between:

Monday, 06/18/2018

Expected Delivery Displayed Externally?:

10:50 - 12:50 Check service calculation information page

Zone: PO Box: 00 N

Other Information

Service Calculation Information

Payment

Payment Type:

Other Postage Payment Account Number:

Postage:

0000000000000 \$19.60

Weight:

Rate Indicator:

3 lb(s) 11 oz(s) Single-Piece Rate

Agent Information

Usps. com
Claim
Usps/ postalingerters

Description Case 1:19-cv-01489-EDK							Associated Labels Associated Labels					
USPS Tracking \$0.00							9405 5016 9802 0158 7372 33					
Events	-											
Event		Event Code	Event Date	Ev	ent ne Local	tion lupr Meti			rrier ute	Posting Date / Th (Central Time)	ne Other Information	1
PRE-SHIPMENT INFO S TO USPS	SENT	MA	07/07/20	18 05:	LOS ANGEL CA 900	ES, Manif 44 Gene		Des	tined to	07/07/2018 08:56:34		-
EXPECTED DELIVERY WINDOW	١	₹VI	06/25/20	18 09:4	LOS ANGEL CA 900/	ES, System	m rated	Exp	ecied oute	06/25/2018 12:02:40		—
DELIVERED, INDIVIDUA PICKED UP AT POSTAL FACILITY		1	06/25/201	8 08:5	LOS	ES, Scann		659 rout	ned by	06/25/2018 19:25:38	Facility Finance	
NTERCEPTED	4-	1	06/25/201	8 08-5	LOS ANGELE CA	S, Scanne	1	Scar 659 route		06/25/2018 19:25:38	Number 05453	
RRIVAL AT UNIT	07		06/25/2018	07.32	LOS ANGELE CA 9004-	S, Scanne	d PASS-00	Desti	C067 ned to C008	06/25/2018	PC / OF Reason	
TRANSIT TO ESTINATION	М	r o	06/24/2018	12:57		Sysiem General				09:46:49 06/24/2018 14.10:34	Code	·
ACKAGE INTERCEPT EQUESTED	VI	G	6/23/2018	21.01	00000	Custom Driven Activity	er			06/24/2018 02:47:32	Case / Confirmation Number:	
ACKING INQUIRY, IVR	VT	06	5/23/2018	13:30		Custome Driven Activity	er			06/23/2018 13:31:38	WEI1221021	
TRANSIT TO STINATION	TH	. 06	6/23/2018	12:57		System Generate	id			6/23/20 1 8 4:08:38		
ACKING INQUIRY, IVR	VT	06,	/22/2018	17:13		Custome Driven Activity	r .		0	6/22/2018 7:14:33		
TRANSIT TO STINATION	ТИ	06/	/22/2018	12:57		System Generate			01	5/22/2018 4:06:38		
ACKING INQUIRY, CALL YTER	VT	06/	21/2018	16:31	LOS ANGELES, CA 90044	Customer Driven Activity				3/21/2018 3:32.59	Parents of the second part is not an indicate Winner	
CKING INQUIRY, IVR	Vī	06/2	21/2018	16:06		Customer Driven Activity				/21/2018 :07.37	****	
CKING INQUIRY, IVR	Vī	06/2	21/2018	15:41		Customer Driven Activity	1.		06,	/21/2018 :42:35		
OUTE/PROCESSED	10	06/2	1/2016	11:57	PHOENIX, AZ 85043	Scanned	PSS-001-36		06/	21/2018 11:47		
TINATION PANSIT TO TINATION	NT NT			12:14 2:14		System Generated System			14:	19/2018 30:37		
ANSIT TO INATION	ТИ			2:14		General-d System	-		14:2	18/2018 26.34 7/2018		alam
OUTE/PROCESSED	10	08/16	72018 0	4:14	BELL GARDENS. CA 90201	Generated Scanned	PSS-001-13		06/1	6/2018		dan 888-
ANSIT TO INATION	NT	06/15/	/2018 12	2:11		System Generaled		ļ	06:2	5/2018		8039
ANSIT TO NATION	NT	06/14/	2018 12	::11	The same of the sa	System Generated		ļ	06/1	4/2018		
NSIT TO NATION	NT	06/13/.	2018 12	:11	F 100 to \$10000 Billion \$1000	System Generated				3/2018		
TE/PROCESSED	10	06/12/2	2018 11	11 (JERSEY CITY, NJ 17097	Scanned	PSM-2-IU		06/12	/2018		el CAIR
	03	06/11/2	2018 16:		ELMONT,	Scanned	POS 216263	Destined to	06/11/ 17:54	/2018	cility Finance	. 2

December 11, 2018

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Erick Scholl and I am writing on behalf of the Belmont Post Office in Massachusetts. Our customer named Cameron Ellis came in on 6/11/2018 and sent a retail ground package to Los Angeles, CA. On 6/23/2018 the customer paid for an intercept and rather than it be intercepted the Post Office allowed an individual to pick it up at the postal facility.

Attached you will find tracking and reporting information, claim for damage, a receipt for the product, and a copy of the customers bank statement with the transaction day and date.

Is it possible for someone to take a closer look at the claim that has been sent? The claim was sent on 11/9/2018.

Thank You for your cooperation with this matter.

Sup Selan

Erick Scholl

Belmont Marlager

Case 1:19-cv-01489-EDK Document 9 Filed 01/14/20 Page 10 of 12

I received a phone call from the claim department phone number 314-345-2900 at 1.02 pm on 12/17/2018. I had mailed a claim form to them by express mail 12/11/2018 tracking number ee386714319us on behalf of Cameron Ellis and his mom. Wendy Murphy. We are trying to resolve a claim on a package that was sent to los Angeles California 90044. The package was sent and arrived 6/25/2018 at 7.32 am.

Tracking number 9534-6121-6263-8162-2413-76 The customer paid to have the package intercepted The package in question was intercepted at 8.58 am 6/25/2018 and then delivered At 8.58 am that same day. Ms Murphy has tried to to resolve this with the united states postal inspection service case number cal ca1329171120 and has not received any response. The person that called me from St Louis—today asked me to have the customer call 1-800-332-0317 press option 9 and have a form 1000—mailed to them I asked if I could print one out or if he could not. The customer service rep from St Louis stated to me that after Ms Murphy sends back the form 1000 she should receive a letter saying claim denied.

Erick B Scholl

Grek Staff ML Belmont Ma 02477

Manáger



JAN 14 2020 OFFICE OF THE CLERK U.S. COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS